



LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
REGIONAL PARK AND  
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT



## Measure A Implementation

Los Angeles County Regional Park and Open Space District

Summary Meeting Notes  
Steering Committee Meeting #4  
September 28, 2017 9:30 am – 12:00 pm

**Steering Committee Members in Attendance:**

Manal Aboelata	Jay Duke	Sandra McNeil
Jean Armbruster	Hugo Enciso	Sussy Nemer
Jane Beesley	Belinda Faustinos	Bonnie Nikolai
Alina Bokde	Hugo Garcia	Dilia Ortega
John Bwarie	Karen Ginsberg	Stefan Popescu
Scott Chan	Mark Glassock	Jeff Rubin
Maria Chong-Castillo	John Johns	Bruce Saito
Cheryl Davis	Tori Kjer	Keri Smith
Reuben R. De Leon	Kim Lamorie	
Reyna Diaz	Linda Lowry	

**Alternate Members in Attendance:** Nicole Jones, Clement Lau, Cara Meyer, Zachia Nazarzai

**AGENDA ITEM: UPCOMING MEETINGS**

1. **Question:** Can we have meeting materials 7 days in advance of the October steering committee meeting? How can we engage the public? Can we make sure people who have attended previous meetings are invited?

**Response:** Yes, materials are provided in advance of the meetings via email. All materials are posted online after the meeting for the public to download. Steering Committee meetings are public meetings and are open to the public, and meeting dates and agendas are posted on the RPOSD website in advance of every meeting. Additional public engagement is planned for spring 2018.

**AGENDA ITEM: GRANTMAKING POLICY**

1. **Comment Summary: Weighting level of need**
  - a. Level of need should not receive highest weighting because it does not treat open space equally because it neglects to provide for the needs of open space and wildlife corridors. We don't want to deprive future generations of trails and open space.

**Response Summary**

- a. The voters supported the measure based on the Needs Assessment, we need to focus on the purpose of the Needs Assessment, which is parks.
- b. The policy includes areas of high need OR "serving high need" which allows for open space projects that directly serve high-need area to be funded. This raises the bar for open space and trails projects to really serve the region better.

- c. We should focus on lowering the need of high and very high need areas, as identified in the Needs Assessment.
  - d. Level of Need is a great way to decide between 2 quality projects that are otherwise equal.
  - e. Level of Need is the most significant criterion and should always have highest weight.
  - f. Seeing the actual weighting will help everyone understand the implications.
  - g. Straw Poll: Who is in favor of Level of Need having the highest weighting?  
In favor: 20  
Opposed: 6  
Abstained: 2
2. **Question:** What are the thresholds for community engagement?  
**Response:** We will discuss this topic in October.
  3. **Comment:** The Grantmaking policy should consider long-range planning with relation to housing and transportation.
  4. **Comment:** High-need areas should receive more technical assistance than areas with lower need.
  5. **Comment:** Maybe there should be a policy regarding hiring and labor practices.
  6. **Comment:** Perhaps there should be a policy about evaluation criteria in general.

**AGENDA ITEM: GRANT GUIDELINES**

1. **Comment Summary: Targeting 30% of Funds**
  - a. General agreement that targeting 30% of Category 3 & 4 funds to high and very high needs area is acceptable.
  - b. General agreement that these funds should be targeted to high and very high need Study Areas.
  - c. “Intentionally and directly serving high-need areas” is hard to prove. Projects not in high or very high need areas can serve those areas. We need to find a way to prove if a project is truly serving a high need area. We also need a definition of what serving a high needs area means.
  - d. Study area level of need and subarea level of need are not interchangeable. The methodology to defining need is a different and this may not allow for apples to apples comparison of need. It complicates the evaluation process and we need a straightforward process (reference to AB31). Targeting this funding for high need subareas could result in all the targeted funds going to red subareas of low need study areas. Much more data on high need subareas is needed before we can decide.  
**Response:** Additional data on subareas will be provided at a future meeting.
2. **Comment Summary: Evaluation Criteria**
  - a. Should be “consistent with long-range plans.”
  - b. This is a great start
3. **Comment Summary: Award Brackets**
  - a. For Category 4 Cultural Facilities, do we really want a maximum that is so high that we give the whole pot to 1 project?
  - b. Keep maximums high because it makes projects more viable.
  - c. Bracket limits need to be re-evaluated in conjunction with the draft competitive grants calendar.

**AGENDA ITEM: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

1. **Comment Summary: Funding**
  - a. General agreement on the components of the program.
  - b. Funds decreasing over time must be strongly connected to success of program. Change language to read “funds *may* decrease over time.” RPOSD must continue investing funds to build a solid program.

- c. Design the program based on need and then identify the cost of the program later. There are also outside funds that can contribute to the TA program.
- d. We need to see the cost evaluation of the program.

**AGENDA ITEM: BONDING**

- 1. **Comment Summary: Process**
  - a. What will the process be like to request bonding?  
Response: Up to individual agencies/cities to decide
- 2. **Comment Summary: Grant Cycles**
  - a. Waiting 4 years for grant cycles is problematic. We need more frequent cycles. People may have greater need for bonding if they have to wait longer to access grant funds. Annual cycles allow for better planning. Voters need to see more regular progress, especially in the first 5-10 years.
  - b. Add TA and Planning & Design funds to grant calendar
  - c. What happens to the interest on bonds?  
**Response:** It goes back to the top and flows back down.

**AGENDA ITEM: PUBLIC COMMENT**

- 1. Support for weighting level of need as the highest weighted evaluation criteria. Doing so will help leverage funds from organizations that fund projects geared toward the demographics represented in high need areas.
- 2. Question: Will there be help with administrative costs?  
Response: Administrative costs can be covered by a portion of allocations and grant funds. Need to differentiate between administration and planning and design costs.

*Meeting Adjourned.*